



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,379	04/10/2006	II-Yoong Park	0630-2382PUS1	3360

2292 7590 04/14/2009
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

COONEY, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/14/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/542,379	Applicant(s) PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner John Cooney	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1796

Applicant's arguments filed 1-12-09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: The spelling of "polyfluoroalkane" and "polyisocyanates" should be corrected in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/05289 in view of Rotermund et al.(6,284,812) and Colafati(5,010,116).

WO-'289 discloses preparation of rigid polyurethane foams prepared from toluene diamine initiated alkylene oxide based polyols having OH numbers meeting those as claimed, water, catalyst in amounts and inclusive of those as claimed, silicone surfactant, polyfluoroalkanes, cyclopentane and polyisocyanates in amounts within or in overlap with the ranges of values of the claims(see abstract, pages 2-12, and examples, as well as, the entire document).

Art Unit: 1796

WO-'289 differs from applicants' claims in that it does not particularly require the blends of sucrose and glycerin as defined by the claims. However, Rotermund et al. discloses sucrose and glycerine to be well known multifunctional polyols used in the action of providing crosslinking in rigid foam formation(see column 4 lines 24-31, as well as, the entire document). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed the sucrose and glycerine crosslinkers disclosed by Rotermund et al. as crosslinkers used in the preparations of WO-'289 for the purpose of imparting their rigidizing crosslinking effect to products formed in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

As to the amounts of the respective components employed in the preparations of the instant concern. It has long been held that where the general conditions of the claims are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimal or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233; *In re Reese* 129 USPQ 402 . Further, a prima facie case of obviousness has been held to exist where the proportions of a reference are close enough to those of the claims to lead to an expectation of the same properties. *Titanium Metals v Banner* 227 USPQ 773. **(see also MPEP 2144.05 I)** Similarly, it has been held that discovering the optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Although WO-'289's teaching is seen to be sufficient in its disclosure of the foaming and gelling catalysts (see page 10 lines 10 and 11) of applicants' claims, it

Art Unit: 1796

differs in that it does not specifically require trimerization catalysts. However, Colafati (column 2 line 63-column 3 line 2, as well as, the entire document) discloses trimerization catalysts to be well known catalysts in preparing rigid foams for purposes of forming rigidized trimer ring linkages in products formed. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed the trimerization catalyst of Colafati as a catalyst used in the preparations of WO-'289 for the purpose of imparting their rigidizing trimer ring linkage formation effect to products formed in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

Applicants' arguments have been considered. However, rejection is maintained. It is maintained that Rotermund et al.'s disclosure is sufficient in remedying the deficiencies of WO-'289 as it pertains to the inclusion of the crosslinking polyols of applicants' claims and offers ranges of amount values meeting and overlapping with the ranges of values of applicants' claims at the endpoints. Here to, as to the ranges of values of applicants' claims, it is held and maintained that the citations of law are appropriate in the instant circumstance.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, particularly applicants' reiteration of the deficiencies of WO-'289, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Art Unit: 1796

As to applicants' arguments that Rotermund et al. does not solve the deficiencies of WO-'289 because it does not teach copolymers of sucrose and glycerol, it is held that applicants' claims as they currently stand do not require that the polyols G & H be copolymer of glycerin and sucrose. Further, it is not seen how copolymers of these polyols might be formed. It is maintained that arriving at the blends of these polyols and their respective amounts is within the purview of the ordinary practitioner in the art in light of the combined teachings of the cited prior art.

As to applicants' showings of results, the following must be considered:

Claims Must be Commensurate With Showings:

Evidence of superiority must pertain to the full extent of the subject matter being claimed. *In re Ackerman*, 170 USPQ 340; *In re Chupp*, 2 USPQ 2d 1437; *In re Murch* 175 USPQ 89; *Ex Parte A*, 17 USPQ 2d 1719; accordingly, it has been held that to overcome a reasonable case of prima facie obviousness a given claim must be commensurate in scope with any showing of unexpected results. *In re Greenfield*, 197 USPQ 227. Further, a limited showing of criticality is insufficient to support a broadly claimed range. *In re Lemin*, 161 USPQ 288. See also *In re Kulling*, 14 USPQ 2d 1056.

Results Must be Unexpected:

Unexpected properties must be more significant than expected properties to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Nolan* 193 USPQ 641 CCPA 1977.

Obviousness does not require absolute predictability. *In re Miegel* 159 USPQ 716.

Since unexpected results are by definition unpredictable, evidence presented in comparative showings must be clear and convincing. *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548.

In determining patentability, the weight of the actual evidence of unobviousness presented must be balanced against the weight of obviousness of record. *In re Chupp*, 2 USPQ 2d 1437; *In re Murch* 175 USPQ 89; *In re Beattie*, 24 USPQ 2d 1040.

Applicants' have not persuasively demonstrated unexpected results for the combinations of their claims. Applicants have not demonstrated their results to be clearly and convincingly unexpected and more than mere optimizations of the knowledge in the art or more significant than being secondary in nature. Applicants' have not demonstrated their showing to be commensurate in scope with the scope of claims as they currently stand.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1796

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John Cooney/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796